

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 6, 8, 9 and 30-33 are pending in this application. The Office Action has rejected and claims 2, 6, 8, 9 and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kubota (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,172) in view of in view of Tsujimoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,841) and further in view of Stahl (U.S. Patent No. 7,072,932).

In claim 2, the Applicant expressly refers to:

“determining means, when said receiving means receives fresh news information, for determining degree of importance of the content of the fresh news information...

wherein said voice output means outputs the text content of the fresh news information as a voice preferentially if said determining means determines the degree of importance of the content of the fresh news information is higher than that of the content of other news information which has already been received.”

The Office Action acknowledges that Kubota and Tsujimoto both “fail to explicitly teach” the above recited subject matter [Office Action, p. 3]. Rather, the Office Action alleges that Stahl teaches this subject matter.

The Office Action cites to the Abstract, and the passages at column 1, lines 37-48, column 2, lines 15-23, column 3, lines 1-12 and 45-59, column 4, line 58 – column 5, lines 17, column 5, lines 46-57, and column 7, lines 27-41. Applicant’s respectfully submit that Stahl only teaches determining from the user’s profile what types of news to deliver as text, audio or video. For example, the passage at column 1, lines 37-48 describes customized information delivery in user-selected formats:

“The present information is directed to a network-based service where different sets of customized information are delivered to a user at different times to different destinations (i.e., different user devices) selected by the user. For example, a user may desire to have a customized set of information such as stock quotes and horoscopes delivered in an audio format to his Internet radio (i.e., a radio configured to receive audio information from the internet). A user may also have desire to have another or the same set of customized information delivered in a video format to his internet television (i.e., a television set configured to receive video information from the Internet).”

This passage is utterly silent regarding determining the degree of importance, and is also silent about outputting text as a voice if the degree of importance is higher than the content of the information already received. The remaining passages and the balance of Stahl’s disclosure are also deficient in this regard. Accordingly, Stahl does not teach or suggest determining the degree of the importance when fresh news information is received. Further, Stahl does not teach or suggest outputting the fresh news preferentially “if said determining means determines the degree of importance of the content of the fresh news information is higher than that of the content of other news information which has already been received,” as recited in Applicant’s claim 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is in allowable form.

Claims 6 and 30-33 which depend from claim 2, and independent claims 8 and 9 should also be in allowable form for similar reasons.

Applicant has chosen in the interest of expediting prosecution of this patent application to distinguish the cited documents from the pending claims as set forth above. These statements should not be regarded in any way as an admission that the cited documents are, in fact, prior art. Likewise, Applicant has not specifically addressed the rejections of each of the dependent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims, from which they depend, are in condition for allowance as set forth above. Accordingly, the dependent claims are

also in condition for allowance. Applicant, however, reserve the right to address such rejection of the dependent claims in the future as appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. **13-4500**, Order No. 1232-4775.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. **13-4500**, Order No. 1232-4775.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: October 24, 2006

By: Scott Bittman
Scott Bittman
Registration No. 55,007

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 Telephone
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile